

No. 5

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, IN VIRGINIA.

INSTALLATION

OF THE

REV. J. F. LATIMER, PH. D., D. D.,

AS

PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY AND POLITY,

ON MAY 6, 1885.

ADDRESSES

OF

THE REV. H. M. WHITE, D. D.,

OF WINCHESTER, VA.,

AND OF

THE REV. PROF. LATIMER.

ALSO,

ADDRESS OF THE REV. J. J. BULLOCK, D. D.,

OF WASHINGTON, D. C.,

TO THE GRADUATING CLASS OF 1885.

Published by request of the Trustees.

RICHMOND:

WHITTET & SHEPPERSON, PRINTERS, COR. 10TH AND MAIN STS.

1885.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

At the annual meeting of the Trustees of Union Theological Seminary, in Virginia, in May, 1884, the Rev. JAMES F. LATIMER, Ph. D., D. D., then a pastor in Memphis, Tenn., was unanimously elected the Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Polity. He accepted the position.

In pursuance of the provisions of the Constitution of the Seminary (Art. II., § 5; Art. IV., § 2), Dr. Latimer was, on the 6th May, 1885, "inducted into office." The Rev. Dr. J. J. Bullock, president of the corporation, propounded to the Professor-elect the constitutional questions, and the Rev. H. M. White, D. D., delivered to him the charge; after which the Professor "delivered a discourse appropriate to his inauguration, in the presence of the Trustees" and a large audience. On the same day President Bullock delivered to the Graduates the diplomas awarded them by the Trustees, with a brief address. By unanimous vote, copies of these several addresses were requested, and are furnished for publication.

CHARGE

OF THE REV. DR. H. M. WHITE TO REV. PROFESSOR LATIMER.

WHEN Dr. Chalmers was called to the chair of Moral Philosophy in the University of St. Andrews, a plain shoemaker in his congregation is said to have remonstrated earnestly against his going. It seemed to him out of all question for so great a preacher to exchange a congregation of a thousand souls for a class of boys in a University. The Doctor, having great respect for the opinion of his humble friend, made ineffectual effort to bring him to see the matter in a different light, until he put this question to him: "Which does the most good, the man who makes the salt or the man who salts the sheep?" His friend replied: "The man who makes the salt." "Very well," said Dr. Chalmers, "I have been salting you sheep in Glasgow for several years, and now I go to St. Andrews to make salt to salt all the sheep in Scotland." His friend seemed convinced by the argument.

You have done well, my brother, in leaving your large church to accept a chair in this Seminary. Here you will teach the preachers, who in turn will teach the parents, who in turn will teach all the children in our Southern Church. Here you will teach those who are to teach the Sabbath-school teachers, who will teach all the children and youth in reach of our Southern Church. Thus you will do a work that shall reach all the souls under the influence of our Church, and extend from generation to generation long after you have entered into rest. A comparison of the productiveness of the labor of the theological professor and of the minister of the gospel over a single church is largely in favor of the former. The steam-engine that runs fifty looms produces fifty times as much as a single loom. The fountain that sends forth fifty rills irrigates fifty times as much as a single rill.

It may be objected that, while this is true of him who teaches Theology proper, or of those who teach the interpretation of the Old and New Testament Scriptures, yet it is not true of him who teaches Ecclesiastical History; for our ministers make but little use of their knowledge of this subject. This objection would be formidable, if the teaching of Church History consisted in simply storing the mind with names, dates and events. This, while important, is a small part of what you are called to do. A mind full of facts, yet unaware of their importance, is a mere table of contents, valuable only for reference. To know the characters that have figured in history, and the principal events with which their names are associated, may make men pedants, but not much more. There is such a thing as the philosophy of history, or history systematized and presented to the mind as a connected whole. Events are the outcome of antecedent causes, and the source of consequent results. To know how to trace the relation between the event and its antecedents on the one hand, and its consequents on the other—this is vital to the proper understanding of history. To know when the Papacy arose, and where, and who were the conspicuous agents in bringing it about; who was the first Pope, and who the first cardinals; this is something of which the Protestant minister should not be ignorant. But to be able to trace full-blown Popery to its root, to untwine that root from the secular institutions on which it has grown, and by which it has been supported, to ascertain when and where the seed was first planted in the Church, and rightly to estimate the evils of the system—this is knowledge inexpressibly valuable. To know when Scholasticism arose in the Church, to give the names of the first scholastics, and their writings, is important; but to be able to trace Scholasticism to its rise and counterbalance its evil by its good results, this is far more important. To know when the great Reformation occurred, the countries which participated in it, and the names of the principal reformers, should be on the fingers' ends of every minister of the gospel. But to have the mind so trained that we can follow up this great event to its fountain head, show where it arose, what tributaries emptied into it, and how its volume was increased until, overflowing its banks, it subverted the foundations of the Church and society, and made for the gospel a new channel in the world; to connect this great event with all its antecedents

causes, by which the under-current of human thought and feeling was made so strong and influential; to give the names of "the reformers before the Reformation," and show how Luther and Melancthon, Zwingli and Beza only reaped where they had sown—this is the task of the true historian, and this is what you are to teach those who pass under your hand. To do this requires patience in study and perseverance in thought. The other method of learning history is simply absorbing information like a sponge. It neither requires much mind to do it, nor does it strengthen the reasoning faculty in doing it. To know the fact, as Pascal tells us, that, if the nose of Cleopatra had been a quarter of an inch shorter, the face of the world would have been changed, is interesting; but to be able to show how this would have resulted from disfiguring that fair queen were a task worthy of the genius of Pascal himself.

Used in this way there is no other department of learning open to man that so trains the mind to think, and at the same time furnishes it with the materials of thought. The purpose of God in his government over this world for the good of the Church is thus brought to light. Annals, correctly kept, are seen to be, not a "chapter of accidents," but the growth of a great idea, the unfolding of a grand scheme, all the parts of which are united in one organic whole. "History is fulfilled prophecy"—the prophecy of him who seeth the end from the beginning, and whose mighty hand is bringing to pass all that is included in his all-comprehensive decree.

Church history is valuable also for its apologetic force. You must be familiar with the reply made by his chaplain to Frederick the Great when asked for a short and conclusive argument in support of the divine origin of Christianity, viz: "The Jew, sire, the Jew," to which the great Frederick bowed assent. This argument is drawn of course from the history of the Jews, and was justly considered satisfactory. The inspiration of the Jewish race is accepted by many even of those who doubt or deny the inspiration of the individuals of that race. The hand of God is so conspicuous in their origin, their history, and their present condition, that all see it who are not wilfully blind. The same is true of Christianity. On the Island of St. Helena General Bertrand asked Napoleon Bonaparte if it was possible that one of his great and

independent mind could believe that the Jew—Jesus—was the son of God. The great Napoleon replied affirmatively, and supported his belief by one of the most striking and powerful arguments in the Christian evidences. This argument is drawn entirely from the history of the kingdom of Christ. Besides these two large departments—the history of Judaism and that of Christianity—there are many separate chapters which carry immense force with reflecting minds. Many have been brought from unbelief to faith by the narrative of the resurrection of Christ from the dead. Indeed, this is justly regarded the corner-stone of our faith. The Church of Christ is built upon a historical fact; on this fact it stands or falls. The conversion of Saul of Tarsus furnishes another chapter in ecclesiastical history which is admirably adapted to convince the doubtful. The commentator Bengel first saw the light of Christian truth on the road to Damascus. No enquirer after truth, who has a fair amount of honesty, can resist the force of those facts about his conversion which the great apostle related so often and so effectively in his preaching, and which he has preserved in his writings. If the history of Judaism alone satisfied the great Frederick, and that of Christianity alone satisfied the great Napoleon, how much force would there be in an argument drawn from these two large volumes! The argument that will probably convince the last skeptic on the earth will be an account of the conversion of the Jewish race, and their re-engrafting into the stock from which they have been so long broken off. I have long thought a new chapter in apologetics might be opened here; one well adapted to the popular mind, readily understood, remembered without difficulty, and increasing in force from age to age. I see from the press that the Rev. Dr. Storrs, of Brooklyn, N. Y., has published a book which, from its title, I suppose to be a development of this idea, but I have not yet had opportunity to examine it.

The light shed by ecclesiastical history on the aggressive work of the Church is another great advantage derived from its study. The Church is now in her prime. Never before, not even in the post-apostolic age, was her internal spirit more pure or powerful, nor her external development and extension more rapid and marked. The age in which we live is signalized by nothing more than the progress the Protestant Church is making in carrying

the gospel into foreign lands and winning converts to Christ. Yet is there division in her counsels. The very elementary principles on which this great work is to be conducted are under debate, and the workmen work in the dark. Our reviews contain long and carefully written articles, and our Assemblies are agitated by earnest discussions on the question of the relations between the foreign and the home Church, and the powers and functions of the officers of each. This is surely strange, after an experience of eighteen centuries. One would think we could learn from the conversion of the Greeks and Romans, and the great German nations, how to convert the heathen in China and Africa. The Reformation ought to show us how to convert the Roman Catholic countries of South America and Mexico. Including the Acts of the Apostles in ecclesiastical history, there is a sense in which it is true that "we have but one lamp by which to guide our feet, and that is the lamp of experience." And it is the duty of the Professor of Church History to hold up this lamp before the Church for the guidance of those who go far hence to the Gentiles.

Here also we see why ecclesiastical history and polity are united in your department. If the tree may surely be known by its fruits, then we may learn from history which of the four forms of polity in the visible Church exerts the happiest influence on society and the governments of earth, and which, therefore, must be more nearly in accordance with the mind of God. Here we should find the bitter fruits of Popery, the blunders of Prelacy, the feebleness of Independency, and the conserving and uplifting power of Presbytery. Here we should learn which Church has furnished the martyrs and the literature to the world, and which has done most to unfetter the human mind and give wings to thought.

In view of the importance of ecclesiastical history and polity seen in the foregoing facts, and many others that might be given, in the name of the Board of Directors who have called you to the work of teaching our candidates for the gospel ministry, I charge you to give yourself wholly to this work. You have not been called to a life of literary leisure, to spend your time luxuriating in the writings of the best thinkers on those subjects which are most congenial to your taste; nor to write books, nor review articles, nor articles for the newspapers; not even to preach the

gospel. The scraps of your time may be given to these things, but the body of it must be sacredly devoted to the hard study of the text-books and literature pertaining to your work. Learn to say with the apostle, "This *one* thing I do." Carry your work on your mind all the day; take it to bed with you at night; awake with it on your mind in the morning. Study church history and polity *always*. Be an enthusiast in your department. This is a much abused word—enthusiasm; but the *thing* is indispensable to success in any undertaking. We have all known men to succeed in life without great intellect or extensive learning, and in spite of many and serious hindrances, growing out of time, place and circumstance; but no one was ever known to succeed at anything without enthusiasm. It is especially necessary in your calling, not only to stir your own mind up to diligence and perseverance, but also to diffuse its ardor into the minds of those whom you teach. Without it your work will be a task and burden to yourself, and but little profitable to those under your care. Study the art of teaching. For teaching is an art—as much so as sculpture or painting, music or architecture. It is an art of the finest kind. Other artists handle stone, or wood, or metal, but you are to handle mind. Their work must decay in time. But the tracery which your mind in its working is to leave on the minds of your pupils shall endure for ever. The force which you are to impart to them is to live and move other minds for good or evil for ever. If he who carves a statue or paints a landscape spends years in study, goes abroad and spends money without stint, in order to perfect himself in his art, how much more should you be regardless of the time and labor spent in learning yours? If the sculptor lays the edge of his chisel upon the rude marble with the utmost precision and painstaking care, how should you tremble as you approach the minds of the uncultured youth whom you are to fashion into vessels of honor for the Master's use! The art of teaching is susceptible of the highest improvement. Of this we have ample evidence in the progress made in the last twenty-five years, both in this country and in Germany. Teaching is not now a pounding of knowledge into the mind, but a stimulating and guiding the mind to learn how to think and discover truth for itself. The art of thinking is worth ten thousand thoughts. And this is pleasant. There is, as another has said,

“an exquisite kind of laughter that comes from the exercise of the reasoning faculties.” The scholars who have been going through this exercise in the school-room come out with glowing countenances as from a gymnasium. There have been but few masters of the art of teaching, as there have been of other arts. Socrates was a master. Dr. Archibald Alexander is said to have been a master. Yet excellence is certainly attainable by all who have good capacity to acquire knowledge and some facility in imparting it to others.

I charge you to realize your dependence on the Holy Ghost, and to seek his help daily in humble and importunate prayer. The Paraclete walks by the side of every believer, to give him help in every walk in life. This is his office-work. He aided Bezaleel and Aholiab in all manner of work for the sanctuary in the wilderness, by putting wisdom and understanding into their hearts. He walks by the side of the humble minister of the gospel in his little village church. How much more shall He put wisdom and understanding into your heart, to do the great work to which you are called! How the Holy Ghost does this work is a mystery as great as the incarnation. We may never understand it in this life. He certainly brings things to our remembrance, for we are expressly told so in at least one instance. If he may aid the reproductive faculty of the mind, why may he not also aid the perceptive faculty? and the creative faculty? Why may he not guide the judgment and quicken the intuitions? The whole economy of the human mind may be, and doubtless is, under His control.

“Wherefore let your voice
Rise, like a fountain, night and day.”

We preachers go from our knees to the pulpit, and you, professors, should go from your knees to the class-room. “The meek will he guide in judgment; the meek will he show His way.”

I charge you to love your pupils. This may sound commonplace to some, and too sentimental to others. It may be thought more appropriate in an address to a company of Sabbath-school teachers. I hope *you* do not think so, my brother. You must have learned by experience that the most common-place texts in the Bible and the most common-place matters in life are the most important, and cannot be neglected without the most serious con-

sequences. Your catalogue states that you and your colleague are "the pastors of the students, and accessible on all proper occasions, to give them counsel on their spiritual interests." A pastor, as you well know, cannot get the ear of his flock unless he loves them. A stranger will they not follow. These young men need counsel. Satan's darts fly thick and fast among them. They who are to be the leaders of the host draw his fire. Moreover, fervent piety is the first great requisite for a minister of the gospel. Therefore, by affectionate counsel and example seek to promote it in them. Nor will you succeed in teaching them without love and with it. The parent is the best teacher, because he loves most. Our Lord could teach the Pharisees nothing, because they had no faith in his love. Words may be the vehicle in which ideas are conveyed from mind to mind, but love is the luminous medium through which it travels.

"Oh! 'tis love, 'tis love, 'tis love,
That makes this world go round."

These simple rules, laid to heart, will fill your career, as professor in this Seminary, with comfort for yourself, and make it a blessing to the Church and to the world.

PROFESSOR LATIMER'S ADDRESS.

MR. PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES:

I AM duly sensible, I trust, of the importance of the task you have to-day formally committed to my hands; and no less sensible am I of its difficulty.

He who reads history merely as a chronicle of events in their outward relations may amuse his leisure hours as with a book of stories, finding in the recital of the deeds of heroes, the growth, the decline, and the fall of empires, an interest akin to that awakened by the novel. But the true student of history knows that the story of the past, read simply as the narrative of events, is not history. The problem which presents itself to him is not merely, What are the facts? but, What are the inner relations of the facts? He recognizes it as his task to trace effects to their causes, and to read the character and importance of the causes in their effects. He knows that not always that which is obtrusive and on the surface, but often what is obscure and easily escapes attention, because of its apparent insignificance, is the really efficient and determining factor. On the pages of the cotemporary chronicler, he must study a picture, which, from the nature of the case, is more or less defective in perspective. He finds there related, in minutest detail it may be, what was suited to appeal to the imagination, or to the passions of the times, while he is left, more often than otherwise, to discover in mere hints and incidental statements the true explanation of the course of events, and therefore the true history of the period which he investigates. Or if he commit himself to the guidance of those who have made a critical study of the sources, and have left on record the product of their labors, he finds them differing often in their interpretations, so that their books prove to be only imperfect and partial presentations of the subject, in the cross lights of which he must seek to discover the truth hidden from the gaze

of each and all. It is for this reason that history, in all its departments, presents one of the most difficult subjects of human investigation. But most difficult of all, as I conceive, is the history of the Church. For while, in secular history, there is this obscure factor, often so controlling in its influence upon the movement of events, it is still a natural element, and traceable to ordinary human motives; but in the history of the Church there is another factor in addition, far more obscure and difficult to deal with, inasmuch as it is due to a life superhuman in its origin, and at the same time a life which resides, not in the entire visible body, but in the bosoms of individuals known with certainty only to God, constituting the invisible or true Church of God. From the very nature of the case, this influence thus exerted cannot be studied directly, but only indirectly. We can never know, beyond all question, that any particular actions of any given individuals are the fruit of the indwelling Spirit; but we are left to detect in the cumulative results of many minor influences those tendencies and movements which can be explained only by the presence of this divine life.

It is for this reason that with hesitation I should undertake the discussion of a topic connected with ecclesiastical history, were I free to choose a subject of a different character. But your command that I shall deliver a discourse appropriate to my induction into the office of Professor in this Institution, leaves me no option. I have thought therefore that, imperfect as the presentation must of necessity be, it would be both interesting and profitable to consider

The Influence of the Invisible upon the Visible Church in the Development of her Creed in Dogmatic Form.

The Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are in themselves complete, and adequate to the end for which the revelation they contain was given. They teach us fully and finally what we are to believe concerning God. They give us all the information we need for our highest interests concerning man's origin and his first estate; they explain his condition of sin and misery, and discover, in all their fulness and completeness, the means and method of his recovery, in its inception, progress and consummation. A

nothing may be taken from them, so may nothing be added to them.

But although the truth is thus revealed in the very words of God, so that all the doctrines which relate to the salvation of the soul are in the Scriptures in their entirety, and, as there given, adapted to become the basis of a living faith, yet they are not set forth in their scientific form and relations.

Now, it was inevitable that the time would come when the process must begin, of giving to the teachings of the Bible systematic shape in explicit creeds. As man is, in every other sphere, a philosopher, such must he become, sooner or later, in his interpretation of the oracles of God; and as God's truth in nature is capable of being so systematized as to satisfy that ruling passion, if I may so speak, of the intellect for order and logical arrangement, so is God's truth, as revealed in the Word. And to the Visible Church, entrusted from the beginning with the oracles themselves, was the important office committed of presiding over the formulation of the truth in scientific statements. But the Church, neither as a whole nor in any of her individual members, was inspired, as were the holy men of old, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. What safeguard was there, then, against the final adoption of those errors which were sure to be developed should the spirit of speculation be left to its natural tendencies in the process of dogmatic explication? We shall find that safeguard, I believe, in the witness of the Invisible Church. Every member of that body, in all the ages, has been the subject of the Holy Spirit's almighty working. The hearts of all have been renewed by his agency, and their eyes opened to apprehend the truth as contained in the Word of God. This truth has been so wrought into the gracious experiences of this chosen people, who in the darkest days have never entirely perished from the earth, as to make their collective influence, sooner or later, an efficient check upon those tendencies of speculation. If we turn to the history of the Church we shall find abundant evidence of the fact that, in all the centuries, the experience of God's people has opposed its postulates to dogmatic error, and has thus been a negative guide to the Church in the formulation of her creed. Although the conflict in which they have earnestly contended for the faith once delivered to the saints presents many different aspects, and their witness is some-

times obscured and rendered uncertain by the form in which the issue is presented, yet their voice has never been hushed; and although ages may have passed before the final result has been reached, yet it has always been the same result—the triumph of the truth.

You will recall the fact, that the first great problem which presented itself for solution in the early Church was that concerning the Trinity. The form in which it challenged attention was in the question, How shall the teachings of the Scriptures in respect to the Unity of the Godhead and the Divinity of the Son be reconciled with each other?

“Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is ONE God,” is the declaration alike of Him whose voice was heard above the thunders of Sinai, and of the Son who came to reveal the Father. And yet, of the Son himself it is said, “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.”

Now, since philosophy knew no numerical identity of Essence consistent with plurality of Persons, she must either be dumb in the presence of the problem she had raised, or find some explanation of the Divinity of the Son which would not imply a personality distinct from that of the Father.

The first solution of the problem given was that the Son of God is not a Divine *Person*, but only a Divine *Energy* manifested in and through the man, Jesus of Nazareth.

But although such a solution might satisfy human philosophy, it could not satisfy the Christian heart, for the simple reason that the faith begotten of the Spirit in every child of God is no mere assent to a formula, but it is trust in a *Divine Person*. From first to last, it lays hold upon that Divine Person, as revealed in the Word of God illumined by the Holy Spirit; and more, it is the Divine Person who is at once the Son of God and the Son of Man—he whose name was called Jesus because he should save his people from their sins. Therefore, no statement which represented the Divine in Jesus as a mere impersonal energy of God could harmonize with the experience of God’s people. That statement could, in consequence, find no permanent place in their creed, nor in that of the Church which was the outward manifestation of their life. Another formula must be found which should distinctly recognize

the Divine Personality of the Son. Then philosophy proposed a second solution, still maintaining, however, as a fundamental postulate, that, as there is *one* God, there can be only *one* Divine Person. It was this: The Divine Person, acting in a certain capacity, and under certain circumstances, is called the *Father*; acting in another capacity, and under other circumstances, he is called the *Son*; so that the Son is only the Father manifesting himself in another character and under another mode.

But the faith of the true Christian lays hold upon the Father no less than upon the Son, and postulates his distinct personality no less than that of the Son. In the light of the truth applied by the Spirit, it recognizes him as reconciled in the Son; as accepting the believer through the Son; as adopting him as his child and as joint-heir with Jesus Christ, who is the Son. And, therefore, no statement which denied to the Father a personality distinct from that of the Son could meet the needs of the Christian heart. It too must yield at length before the persistent practical protest of the people of God, and was finally rejected as not only inadequate but false.

It is not necessary that I should pursue this line of illustration further, through all that period of controversy, until at length speculation was compelled to adjust itself to the postulates of the experience of the faithful on every point, and the invisible Church triumphed in the adoption, on the part of the visible Church, of that doctrine of the Trinity which we profess to-day, that "in the unity of the Godhead there be three persons, of one substance, power, and eternity—God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. The Father is of none, neither begotten nor proceeding; the Son is eternally begotten of the Father; the Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son."

The history of the controversy concerning the person of Christ—the relations of the divine and human in him—also reveals to us this regulative influence of the Christian consciousness upon speculation, and we find the invisible Church triumphing again, albeit after a conflict and a series of protests extending over centuries, in the incorporation in the creed of a statement harmonious with the truth in all its aspects, to-wit: "That two whole, perfect, and distinct natures, the Godhead and the manhood, were inseparably joined together in one person, without conversion, composi-

tion, or confusion—which person is very God and very man, yet one Christ, the only mediator between God and man.”

As we pursue our investigation in search of evidence of the influence of the invisible Church in preventing the final adoption of error in the formulated creed, we discover a fact no little perplexing, namely, the sudden arrest of progress when the point is reached at which we should expect the full development of the doctrines of grace. We find, it is true, a noble beginning made by Augustine, who, in opposition to the errors of Pelagius, sets forth in its final form the doctrine of man's inability, and the consequent absolute necessity of divine grace in order to the inception and growth of the new life in the soul—a doctrine which, from that day to this, has found its ample justification in the experience of the saints. But just here the movement ceases. There are hints, it must be admitted, in the writings of Augustine, and in those of other fathers, which look to the explicit statement of the doctrine of justification by faith, which alone explains the method by which the soul is brought within the sphere of the gracious influences of the Holy Spirit: but there are hints and no more. Nor is this a mere temporary pause in the process of scientific formulation. For one thousand years the work stands arrested practically where Augustine left it.

This phenomenon, so strange at first sight, loses its abnormal aspect, however, as our study of the facts reveals to us the insidious growth of error, not in formulated dogma, but error no less efficient for evil, because operating only in practice at first, and, for ages afterwards, so undefined and ambiguous in its character as to elude the full force of the protest of the true saints of God in the Church.

As we look back from our standing point, we see what the real nature of that error was, and in the light of that knowledge we discover the cause of this sudden arrest of progress of the creed to its completion.

It is a familiar fact that, long before the time of Augustine, the original constitution of the Church had been perverted, and changed from the Presbyterian to the Prelatical form; and that, connected with the elevation of some of the bishops above their

fellow bishops or presbyters, the entire body of the so-called clergy had come to be regarded as a class distinct from, and superior to, the people. It was no longer a *ministry*, the efflorescence of the universal priesthood of believers; but became henceforth a proper priesthood, superseding that only God-ordained priesthood upon the earth. From that time did this priesthood of man's invention arrogate to itself more and more the right to stand between believers and God, and to constitute the only channel through which grace could be communicated to them. The sacraments which it administered were the only means of salvation, since through them alone was grace given. Faith no longer brought the soul into direct relations with the Son of God; it brought men to the church,—that is, to the priest,—to receive the sacraments. In baptism administered by those holy hands, the habit of grace, or spiritual life, was infused; confirmation gave increase of that life; by the eucharist it was renewed and strengthened; and by penance recruited from the effects of sin. Thus by priestly manipulation was an inherent righteousness so-called communicated, fostered, and developed; and it was this righteousness which was supposed to secure the favor of God. Christ's righteousness was, it is true, the remote cause of the believer's justification, but only as the merits of that righteousness secured the operation of the scheme by which the Church, through her priesthood, rendered men inherently holy, and made the fruits of the life conferred meritorious. It was the merit of this inherent righteousness which became, in each individual case, the immediate ground—the formal cause—of justification. This is the Romish scheme in its full development, but which, in all its essential features, became operative two hundred years before the time of Augustine, and the influence of which was more or less felt in that early period of the Church.

Need I say that it was in effect a method of *justification by works*? It matters not that the new life supposed to be begotten and nurtured in the soul was implanted and sustained by grace; it was still the merit of the fruits borne by that life which rendered a man acceptable in the sight of God. Christ's righteousness, and the merit of it, became, in no sense, the individual possession of the soul. What place was there then for the doctrine of justification by faith, which appropriates the righteousness of

Christ and rests upon the merits of that alone for acceptance with God? There was none. It was excluded by the law of works.

Now, this subtle system of salvation by works, under the name of salvation by grace, being thus built into the very structure of the Church and of her worship, could not, from the nature of the case, but prevent the formulation of the doctrine of justification by faith as an article of her creed. What Augustine had taught concerning the absolute need of grace might be harmonized with the sacerdotal system of salvation; nay, might be, and was, regarded as demonstrating the urgent necessity of grace conferred *ex opere operato*, and therefore no hindrance lay in the way of its incorporation with the creed; but far otherwise was it with justification by faith.

It naturally suggests itself to us here to inquire, Why was the doctrine of justification by works, thus shown to lie implicitly in the theory and practice of the Church, not explicitly stated and adopted as part of her creed?

It is a most significant fact that it was not; and the explanation of it recalls us to the consideration of the efficiency of the invisible Church within, and upon, the visible body. You will recollect that we found that this influence was felt in the Trinitarian controversy, not as a positive, but as a negative, influence; as a restraint upon the final adoption of error in dogmatic form. There error presented in distinct statements appeared over and over again before the tribunal of Christian consciousness, and as such was as often condemned; but in every instance the error lay largely in defect and inadequacy of conception. Always there was truth emphasized, although exaggerated in some aspect of it so as to exclude other truths. Now, it was these elements of truth, too exclusively contemplated though they were, which in each case gave such plausibility to the conception as to secure its being entertained temporarily at least by those whose experience subsequently condemned it. Thus these conceptions were one after another enunciated, though they were finally abandoned, before the protest of the people of God, as inadequate. Not so, however, with the postulates which underlay this sacerdotal method of justification and salvation which I have described. Those postulates could not be expressed in dogmatic statement without revealing fundamental error in the whole and in every part. But the true

Israel of God was still within this visible Church, and still clinging to her with reverence and devotion as the Bride of the Lord; and the presence of the members of this invisible communion of saints constituted, under the providence of God, an efficient check upon the Church's final and complete apostasy in the distinct enunciation and formal adoption of the error logically involved in her practice and worship. Thus, while the energies of the invisible Church were apparently paralyzed, they were really operative in the exertion of a powerful restraining influence.

But we must not suppose that this divine life in the elect people of God was without more positive manifestation of its existence and efficiency. For although the practical perversion of the truth by the Church with which they still remained in communion reacted upon those who were the subjects of divine grace, and in turn hindered them from giving legitimate expression, in explicit form, to the great doctrine of justification by faith, yet there are abundant indications that they did not acquiesce in the error, veiled and hidden though it was.

Allow me to point you, in the first place, to the dissatisfaction manifested at so early a period, and growing greater so constantly down to the Reformation itself, with the practical results, in the lives of multitudes, of that scheme of so-called grace and salvation.

I need not pause here to prove to this audience the fact, nor to explain it, that a system of work-righteousness always does, and always must, bear the fruits of antinomianism and ungodliness. So it was here. From the time that the Church began to dispense her sacramental grace as the basis of an inherent righteousness, did those who acquiesced in it begin to find encouragement to sin that grace might abound. It was man's method of salvation by grace which is no more grace, and it bore its appropriate fruit in legitimating sin and making men tenfold more the children of the devil than they were before.

Now those who had really experienced the grace of God in their hearts, although they did not recognize the root of the evil, knew that these fruits were not such as they ought to be; and they lifted up the voice of protest, which was never hushed during that dreary thousand years and more,—a persistent protest, which gathered volume till it forced a hearing, against the tolerance of ungodliness *in* the Church and *by* the Church. Being a protest

against the fruits of a system of justification by works, it was in directly opposition to the unannounced doctrine which legitimated it.

It is, as affording evidence of this deep-seated dissatisfaction on the part of God's true people within the Church, that the Montanist, the Novatian and the Donatist schisms are of interest to us. The wild extravagances of these sectaries should not blind us to the fact that the movement, in each instance, began with, and was based upon, the earnest conviction of the necessity for reform in the discipline of the Church. Nor must we suppose that those alone who ran into such fanatical excesses, and have been branded in the records of the times with the stigma of schism, were concerned in that protest. He has read history to little purpose who has not learned that when great principles lay strong hold upon the feelings of large masses of men there will always be those who carry those principles to extremes and run into fanaticism and error; and that these extremists and their perversion of the movement are likely to find place in the chronicles of the period, while no record is left of the fact that thousands were involved who yet refused to go beyond the bounds of moderation. In these several movements, then, we have evidence that the Invisible Communion as a whole was deeply stirred in view of the fact that the visible Church was not an institute of holiness, but the opposite.

Nor must we be misled as to the true nature of the issue involved. It might appear to superficial observation that those who made this protest against slackness of discipline were essentially legalists, while the Church was contending for the principle that persons whose lives were defective might still sustain a saving relation to Christ:—that man is not the judge, but God alone. Such a view is, however, altogether misleading. What lay behind these movements, and gave them vitality and vigor, was the conviction on the part of true believers that such personal righteousness as gives proof that its seat is in the heart is the alone evidence that the soul is resting on Christ by faith, and that the Church was putting Christ and his righteousness in the background, and thus preventing access to the true fountain of grace. It was this which sustained the cry in the centuries which followed for reform of the Church in head and members, and ever added emphasis to it.

Although it seemed to be the expression of the spirit of legalism, it was really the utterance given to the witness of God's Spirit in the experience of the elect against the system of justification by works, which had made legitimate a righteousness of mere outward forms and ceremonies, and had thus hushed conscience and given free rein to "the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life."

In the light of this truth alone can we understand the history of all that dark period, and of the struggle which went forward through the century of reforming councils down to the Reformation itself.

But again, this practical perversion of the truth on the part of the visible Church made it impossible that she should meet the deepest spiritual needs of the invisible community of saints within her. The dissatisfaction due to this fact manifested itself in a series of significant movements, which again constitute so many practical protests against the fundamental error which she fostered.

You will call to mind the fact that essentially connected with the system by which grace was supposed to be infused and the existence of an inherent righteousness secured as the basis of acceptance with God was the elevation of the clergy into a priesthood, and the practical denial of the priesthood of all believers. Thus were the saints cut off from direct access to the Father through the great highpriest of their profession, and communion with the Church substituted for it. But such communion could not satisfy the longing of the truly pious heart for fellowship with God; and hence the disposition which manifested itself so early, on the part of men of devout spirit, to get away from the hindering influence of the priesthood of the Church, and to find in solitary places, in caves of the earth, and in the trackless forests, opportunity for uninterrupted communion with heaven. Underneath the extravagance and fanaticism of the stylites and other hermits lay this urgent need of the renewed soul. And here again the fanatical manifestation in the actions of a comparative few reveals what was working in the bosoms of thousands besides, too sober in spirit for such excesses. Monasticism itself, historically connected as it is in its beginning with those anchorites of the desert, is a witness, in its early history, to the exist-

ence of the same desire to be free from all hindrance to direct fellowship with the Father of spirits. And although, at a later period, the Church, with the wisdom of the children of this world, adopted that institution, and made it her minister and ally, we must not forget that, even after all the changes which ages had wrought, it was not without a struggle that it acquiesced in its new relations; and that, in the time which followed, the monasteries were the refuge of many devout spirits, who sought within their walls opportunity for meditation and nearer approach to heaven. And those who fled to these monasteries left behind them multitudes burdened with the same consciousness of needs unmet, and of aspirations unsatisfied. This was all, when understood aright, a most touching and pathetic protest against the priestly incantation, the sacramental grace, and the plan of justification by works which the Church had substituted for the direct approach of the soul by faith to the fountain of Christ's blood, and to a Father reconciled in him.

It was this same longing, for the satisfaction of which the Church had nothing to offer, which manifested itself in the constantly recurring tendency to mysticism in the middle ages. If God's own appointed way of approach to him was closed, the soul would find some other method of knowing him and drawing near into his presence. While among these mystics there were many wild and self-deceived fanatics, there were also many who could, in all sincerity, adopt the cry of the psalmist as their own: "As the hart panteth after the waterbrooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God. My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God: when shall I come and appear before God?" (Ps. xlii. 1, 2.) "O God, thou art my God; early will I seek thee; my soul thirsteth for thee, in a dry and thirsty land where no water is." (Ps. lxiii. 1.) "I stretch forth my hands unto thee: my soul thirsteth after thee as a thirsty land." (Ps. cxliii. 6.)

As we peer out into the darkness, and hear these plaintive voices echoing through the gloom, we may be tempted to ask: "How long, O Lord, holy and true?" Ah! my soul, possess thyself in patience! God's good time shall come. The protest shall be heard, interpreted, and heeded.

Again, I call your attention to the significant demand, made

over and over again, for the word of God in the vernacular; and the persistent efforts, in different centuries and in widely separated countries, to place the Scriptures in the hands of the people. It was only another form of the protest against the practical nullification on the part of the Church of the priesthood of believers, and indirectly against her method of justification by inherent righteousness and by works.

I shall not enter here upon the disputed question of the origin of the Waldenses. It matters not, for the purpose in hand, though it be admitted that the history of this devoted people cannot be traced beyond the twelfth century. It is well known that at that time, and ever afterwards, the burden of the demand they made was for the Holy Scriptures in the hands of all, and in the language understood by all. What did it mean but that the Church's method of salvation had been tried and found wanting? What did it mean but that, when God's children asked for bread, she gave them a stone? It signified the presence of a determination which even blood could not drown to reassume the functions of the priesthood of the saints, and, rejecting Rome's mediation, to find Christ, the object of their faith, in the Scriptures which testified of him. It was for this that they contended in the face of untold cruelties. For this did they die, those "slaughtered saints of God . . . whose bones lie scattered on the Alpine mountains cold."

I need only mention Wyclif and his efforts to give the word of God to the people in the fourteenth century, and the self-denying labors of his followers, the slandered Lollards, to the same end, up to the Reformation period in England; nor need I do more than call the names of John Hus and Jerome of Prague, who, in the fifteenth century, sealed at the stake their devotion to the same cause. These all were in effect giving voice to the one cry, "The Church's system of grace is no grace. She hides from us Christ, the only Saviour of sinners. Give us Christ in his word that our faith may take hold of his righteousness. In that alone can we find peace and reconciliation with God."

And by the Waldenses, and these reformers before the reformation, was united with that which has just been described the other form of protest also, which had been gathering force and weight as the centuries came and went, against the fruits of ungodliness.

fostered by the Church's scheme of sacramental grace and work righteousness.

It may be thought that all these protests of the Invisible Church against error had been ineffectual in the past, but they were not. It is the old story of half hidden forces working obscurely and with tendencies misunderstood. At length the day of their manifestation was approaching. Rome felt that it was coming, and that she could no longer be indifferent. And now she who had so long since surrendered the sword of the Spirit, moved by the instinct of self-preservation, seized the axe of persecution, and sought to drown these protests in blood. It was her only resource. In that process by which she had gradually been transformed from the Church of God into the mystic Babylon, she had built into her very structure justification by works. It had become her life, and it was at this life that these reformers were really striking. She knew that she must be rid of them or perish from the earth.

But now, at last, the day was come when that protest, in all its forms, was to be interpreted so that all could understand its true character and significance; and then the victory, which had been hanging in the balance for ages, was won. The energies of the Invisible Church, apparently paralyzed in the grasp of the leviathan, awoke to new vigor, and the long arrested development of the creed was resumed.

I need not recount to you the story of the protracted struggle of the monk in his cell at Erfurt; nor how there dawned upon him, as the result, the true meaning of that scripture, "The just shall live by faith," and he found peace and joy in the consciousness that the righteousness of Christ was his. Joy was it indeed to that burdened heart, and joy—to the world! Nor need I tell you, for you know it well, how, out of a glad experience, he began to publish that truth so old, and yet so new to him, so new to others; nor need I dwell upon the circumstances which led to his bold denunciation of the barter of indulgences for money, and the startling discovery that that church which till then he had revered and loved, was fatally wedded to another gospel, which was no gospel.

As we survey the wonderful results of the movement instituted by this single man, they may well appear to be effects without an

adequate cause, until we recognize the fact that Luther simply interpreted the consciousness of God's people to themselves. He gave distinct and intelligible enunciation to that truth which, present implicitly in their experience, had inspired all those protests in the past. He showed them what the true nature of that error was against which they had so long been contending; and the Invisible Church arose in the might which a clear comprehension of the truth had given her, and gave voice to her witness for that truth in tones of thunder, which shook christendom from centre to circumference.

And now was revealed clearly the fact that Rome was past reformation; that she had no place for those who counted all other righteousness as filthy rags but "the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ;" and the great body of the faithful came out of her, to constitute a new visible communion, a fitting outward manifestation of the communion of saints. If any true believers remained within her borders—and doubtless some unenlightened in the fulness of the gospel did remain—they were in her as they were in the world, but not of her; though called by her name, they were not her children. They were a remnant—the captive Israel of God—sitting mournfully by the rivers of Babylon, with harps hanged upon the willows, who might well have answered those who mocked them with idle mummary and required of them a song, "How shall we sing the Lord's song in a strange land?" (Psalm cxxxvii.)

If we turn now to the various branches of the true Church, we witness an unexampled activity in the development of the creed in respect to the doctrines of grace, so long obscured by the sacramental system dispensed by Rome. As that so-called church, rid at last of the restraining influence of the Invisible Church, had, in the decrees of the Council of Trent, given explicit statement to her errors, thus making complete and final her apostasy from the truth, so was that truth, enunciated in counter statements by God's people, henceforth a witness against the error. The Invisible Church once more exerts her efficiency, and the creed proceeds to its completion as an adequate statement of the doctrines revealed in Scripture.

I know that there are facts which show that all the people of God do not, even yet, see eye to eye, after the lapse of the centu-

ries which have passed since the Reformation period. There are still differences which need to be adjusted, and more than one branch of the true Church of God (which shows that it is such by the fruits of the Spirit borne by those who are its devout adherents,) still acquiesces in formulæ which, properly understood, imply semi-Pelagian error.

But although Calvinist and Arminian have not yet attained to absolute agreement in the statement of all the doctrines of grace, that fact only proves that there are difficult speculative problems involved in those doctrines which both have not solved with equal success. The Arminian has not yet risen to that point of vision whence he may see that the Calvinist's statement of the doctrine of inability does not exclude free agency, and thus make insincere and meaningless the gospel call which comes to every man alike. He makes a protest against what he conceives to be the obscuration of one of the most precious of the truths revealed in the Word of God.

Once the doctrine of inability, in all its relations, rightly apprehended, semi-Pelagianism shall be banished in word, as absent ever in fact, from the true Church of God in all her members. And with that exclusion must come the recognition of the truth of the doctrine of God's electing grace, logically involved in it. But already is it true, as implied in what has just been said, that the difference is rather in word than in reality. Need I cite the familiar fact that Arminians and Calvinists are at one upon their knees? They offer petitions perfectly harmonious at the throne of grace. They sing the same songs. The great distinctive doctrines which we preach find as hearty acceptance in Arminian pulpits as in our own, when stripped of that terminology which has been misunderstood. No! there is no Pelagianism in any genuine Christian experience. There is no Pelagianism in the Invisible Church; and, blessed be God, the Invisible Church is not known by the name of John Calvin, or of Martin Luther, or of John Wesley, but by that name which is above every name—the name of Jesus Christ. And because his Spirit is in that church, we shall all at length see eye to eye, and speak the same things, and join at last, with perfectly harmonious voices, in that glad acclaim, "Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but unto Thy name give glory, for Thy mercy, and for Thy truth's sake." (Ps. cxv. 1.)